88-584

No. 88—

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 5 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1988

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

---

30 pp

Questions Presented

I

When will the United States of America confront and permanently resolve the submerge issue relating to the subjugation of rights upon women that has existed since the birth of the nation.

II

When the courts of Texas openly deny to women their constitutional and civil rights—why do the federal courts, agencies, and officials purposely ignore such defiant subjugation of rights, and permit that such be perpetrated.

III

What apartheid power do the Texas and federal judges have, to relegate women to an inferior bondage level, by publicly stigmatizing women before the courts, as of "mental illness and emotionally disturbed complainants"—so as to silence their voice for their equal rights.[1-2]

IV

What national document or statute laws indicates that women before the courts of the nation, have to have a lawyer in order to qualify for their constitutional and civil rights before the courts.

V

If aggression, terror and torture are condemned upon foreign nations by the United States of America—why are such injustices and human rights violations permitted to be imposed upon women within the United States of America.[3]

---

1. See Appendix III, Sec. B, p. 16a.
2. See Appendix II, Sec. C, p. 10a.
3. See Appendix III, Sec. C, p. 18a.

VI

Why are one-sided judgments, and one-sided-selected juries imposed upon women—as the one-sided final judgments imposed upon Petitioner without her defense, and the jury forced on Petitioner, totally selected by the prosecution.

VII

Why was Petitioner, before the Texas court, threatened, intimidated, forced to disclose her medical and academic records, stigmatized as mentally ill—and denied her petitions, motions and pleadings.

VIII

Why has the United States of America permitted Texas to deny to the Hispanic woman the right of self-defense, the right to protect her property from force and aggression, and the rights to constitutional, civil, and human rights.[4]

IX

If the United States of America, long ago, extended equal rights to the Negroid people—why are the subjugation of equal rights still imposed upon women before the courts.

X

If a dangerous terrorist is given every opportunity to a fair hearing and a fair trial within a West Germany court—why have the courts in the United States of America denied every vestige of justice and humanity to Petitioner—denied the very basic rights to a fair hearing and a fair trial.

---

4. See Appendix III, Sec. A, p. 13a.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Questions Presented	1
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Hearings Involved	2
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved	4
Statement of the Facts	4
Reasons for Granting the Writ	6
Conclusion	8
APPENDIX I	
Section A—Federal Courts Involved	1a
Section B—Texas Courts Involved	4a
APPENDIX II	
Section A—Court Of Appeals Involved	8a
Section B—Court Of Appeals Rehearing	9a
Section C—United States District Court	10a
APPENDIX III	
Section A—Violations Of Rights	13a
Section B—Fact Information	16a
Section C—The Inhuman Ordeal	18a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE

Constitution and Statutes:

U.S. Const. amend. IV 13a
U.S. Const. amend. V 13a
U.S. Const. amend. VI 13a
U.S. Const. amend. VIII 13a
U.S. Const. amend. XIV 14a
U.S. Code, Title 42, Sec. 1983 ..... 14a
U.S. Code, Title 42, Sec. 1985(3) 14a
U.S. Code, Title 18, Sec. 141 ..... 14a
U.S. Code, Title 18, Sec. 142 ..... 14a

No. 88—

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1988

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, Pro se, prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review a judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It is that the basic issue involved in the presentation of Petitioner before the Court, relates to the grave violations of rights upon women by the courts.

The state and federal courts defiantly deny women their rights, and Petitioner can verify such injustices.

Opinions Below

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, based its dismissal of Appeal No. 88-2246 on Local Rule 47.5—and upheld the dismissal of Civil Action No. H-88-0277 filed at the United States District Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division.[5]

The United States District Court at the Houston Division, by its presiding Judge James De Anda, dismissed Civil Action No. H-88-0277 as "*sua sponte* dismissed the suit with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)."[6]

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C., Sec. 1254(1)—and to Local Court Rule 17(1)(c) and 17(2).

Within Local Court Rule 17(1)(c), the Court must confront the documented dictates of the Texas and Federal judges who have subjugated the rights of Petitioner before the courts with deadly stigmas that segregate women from the security to equal rights guarantees of the Constitution.

Hearings Involved

The United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit—Appeal No. 88-2246, filed March 11, 1988, and dismissed on July 14, 1988—Rehearing dismissed on August 4, 1988.[7]

5. See Appendix II, Sec. A, p. 8a.
6. See Appendix II, Sec. C, p. 10a.
7. See Appendix II, Sec. B, p. 9a.

The United States District Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. Civil Action No. H-88-0277, filed with date of January 29, 1988, and dismissed with date of February 24, 1988. The most vicious discriminatory dismissal document since the Dred Scott discriminatory dismissal document of March 6, 1857, by the Supreme Court of the United States.[8]

The 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas—Cause No. 38,011 (1987-88—Civil), and Petitioner as Defendant. Petitioner declared guilty by the judge without hearing the defense of Petitioner.[9]

The 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas—Cause No. 20,730 (1986-88—Criminal), and Petitioner as Defendant. Petitioner declared guilty by a one-sided selected jury.[10]

The 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas—Cause No. 8548 (1985-88—Civil), and Petitioner as Defendant. Petitioner declared guilty without a hearing.[11]

The 111th District Court for Webb County, Texas—Cause No. 31,320 (1979-81), and Petitioner as Defendant. Petitioner was declared guilty in a one-sided judgment without the defense, and incarcerated for insisting on presenting the defense.[12]

---

8. See Appendix II, Sec. C, p. 10a.
9. See Appendix I, Sec. B, p. 4a.
10. See Appendix I, Sec. B, p. 5a.
11. See Appendix I, Sec. B, p. 6a.
12. See Appendix I, Sec. B, p. 7a.

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

The following constitutional and statutory provisions set forth in Appendix III, Section A, are involved in the questions presented by this petition.[13]

The Fourth Amendment; The Fifth Amendment; The Sixth Amendment; The Eight Amendment; The Fourteenth Amendment;—42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983; 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1985(3); 18 U.S.C. Sec. 141; 18 U.S.C. Sec. 142.

Statement of the Facts

This petition presented to the Court by Petitioner, clearly exposes factual evidence of the tremendous injustices and inhuman violations of rights upon women, imposed by the courts and by officials and officers within the United States of America.

The conspiracies between the Texas judge and the federal judge, to strike the fatal blow of silence upon Petitioner by declaring Petitioner as of mental illness, is identical to the savage conspiracies of years ago, between state and federal judges who denied the Negroid their rights and keep them in bondage.

The documented declaration by the Texas judge, Manuel Flores of the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas—publicly declaring Petitioner as of mental illness, without reason or cause—is now a warning to all women, especially the Hispanic woman, that they will be considered as inferior

13. See Appendix III, Sec. A, p. 13a.

and as of mental illness before the Texas courts, and so denied their rights.[14]

The dismissal document by the United States District Court Judge James De Anda, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division—will become another shameful document as the Dred Scott case, in the history of inhuman discrimination, subjugation of rights, and judge bigotry.

Such vicious dismissal document upon Petitioner by Judge James De Anda, declares to all women that they will be identified as "emotionally disturbed", and thus subjugated of their rights within Judge De Anda's court or other federal courts.[15]

The procedures used by the Texas and Federal judges to silence the rights of Petitioner before the court with the stigma of mental illness, is the same procedures used upon women in the Soviet Union.

In the appeal before the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, the attorneys representing the United States of America, chose to protect the segregation dictates of federal judge James De Anda, instead of protecting the doctrines of equal rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America.

Thus, it is a fact that Petitioner has been inhumanly persecuted for more than nine years from court to court with false charges, denied every vestige of justice and humanity, found guilty without the defense, processed by a

14. See Appendix III, Sec. B, p. 16a.
15. See Appendix II, Sec. C, p. 10a.

one-sided selected jury, denied her right to a fair hearing and a fair trial, intimidated, terrorized and tortured, robbed of her property without due process of law, identified in the national records as a criminal without ever being told on what charges.[16]

Thus it is a fact that federal agencies as Justice Department, FBI, Civil Rights, and Criminal Divisions have totally denied the equal protection of the law to Petitioner.

Reasons for Granting the Writ

It is that Petitioner can be the voice of thousands of women in the United States of America, who have been, and are being denied their constitutional and civil rights—and have been robbed of their property and liberties while being denied their rights before the courts.

It is that Petitioner identifies with the thousands of women who have been robbed of their rights and property within conspiracies of the courts, while being imposed with the stigma of mental illness, so as to silence their right to present their defense.[17]

It is that Petitioner, along with millions of women in the United States of America, have waited for the Congress to extend equal rights to all women—but have waited in vain.

---

16. See Appendix III, Sec. C, p. 18a.

17. See Appendix II, Sec. C, p. 10a and Appendix III, Sec. B, p. 16a-17a.

If the Court refuses to accept the Writ (1) Petitioner will never see a court of justice (2) Petitioner will never have the opportunity to prove her innocence (3) Petitioner will live in fear of being identified as of mental illness if approaching the courts as pro se (4) Petitioner will live in fear of being attacked inside her property and denied the right to self-defense (5) Petitioner will have to keep on paying extortion to those who threaten with court action (6) Petitioner will see her ranch taken over by force and aggression by criminal trespassers (7) Petitioner will live in fear of being terrorized and tortured into giving up her rights.

It is that Petitioner, along with countless of women will have to give up part of their property to crooks and swindlers, or be processed with intimidation, terror, torture, confrontation in sold-out courts, denial of rights, imposed with one-sided selected juries, one-sided judgments, sentenced to prison, stigmatized by judges as mentally ill, and robbed of their property and liberties—all within the dictates and savage commands of terrorist traitors, who have infiltrated the courts and officials positions in a silent overthrow of the government.

Conclusion

Petitioner pleads with the Court to bring to an end the bondage imposed on womens' rights, and to permit Petitioner to go before the Court with her cause.

Petitioner approaches the Supreme Court of the United States with hopes that a secure declaration from the Court will permanently protect all women in their basic rights.

If the Congress of the United States of America has continually ignored the cry for equal rights to women—let the United States Supreme Court lead the way to womens' equal participation in the constitutional, civil, and human rights.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez

Maria Graciela Ramirez
Petitioner, Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Courts

Section A—Federal Courts Involved

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS,
FIFTH CIRCUIT

Appeal No. 88-2246

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Defendant-Appellee.

Chief Judge: Judge CLARK

Circuit Judges: WILLIAMS AND DAVIS

Plaintiff-Appellant Counsel:
MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, *Pro se*

Defendant-Appellee Counsel:
SARAH A. TUNNELL
FRANK A. CONFORTI
PAULA C. OFFENHAUSER

Appendix I

Motions:

Plaintiff-Appellant—Notice of Appeal.
Filed March 11, 1988

Plaintiff-Appellant—Appellant's Brief.
Filed April 12, 1988

Defendant-Appellee—Brief for Defendant-Appellee.
Filed May 11, 1988

Plaintiff-Appellant—Reply Brief For Appellant. Filed May 27, 1988

Plaintiff-Appellant—Emergency Motion For Stay Pending Appeal. Filed June 8, 1988

Plaintiff-Appellant—Appellant's Pleading For Relief. Send July 7, 1988

Court—Decision to Dismiss in favor of Defendant-Appellee. Filed July 14, 1988

Plaintiff-Appellant—Appellant's Petition For Rehearing. Send July 20, 1988

Court—Petition For Rehearing denied. Filed August 4, 1988

Appendix I

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HOUSTON DIVISION

Civil Action No. 88-0277

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

Presiding Judge: James DeAnda

Plaintiff Counsel:

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, *Pro se*

Defendant Counsel:

United States Attorney, HENRY ONCKEN

Motions:

Plaintiff—Original Complaint. Filed January 29, 1988
Court— Motion denied. Filed February 24, 1988
Plaintiff—Notice of Appeal. Filed March 11, 1988

Appendix I

Section B—Texas Courts Involved

THE 49TH DISTRICT COURT

FOR WEBB COUNTY TEXAS

Cause No. 38,011

GENARO DELEZA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Defendant.

Presiding Judge: MANUEL R. FLORES AND RICHARD J. WOODS

Visiting Judge: E. JAMES KAZEN

Plaintiff Counsel: LAZARO GARZA GONGORA JR., AMADOR GUTIERREZ JR., TERESA HUNTER

Defendant Counsel: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, *Pro se*

Motions:

Civil Action 1987-1988— Adverse news-media publicity upon Defendant, and Defendant denied a Change of Venue. Defendant denied a fair hearing and a fair trial, and declared guilty by the presiding judge, without hearing the defense.

All motions, petitions and pleadings presented by Defendant, ignored by the judges.

Appendix I

THE 49TH DISTRICT COURT

FOR WEBB COUNTY TEXAS

Cause No. 20,730

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Defendant.

Presiding Judge: MANUEL R. FLORES AND TRUMAN ROBERTS

Plaintiff Counsel: District Attorney JULIO GARCIA and Assistants BARRERA AND RIOS

Defendant Counsel: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, *Pro se*

Motions:

Criminal Action 1987-1988—Defendant was terrorized and mentally tortured into signing false confessions, was denied a Change of Venue in the face of adverse publicity, was forced to be a witness against herself, was denied all her motions, petitions, and pleadings, was maliciously and inhumanly accused of mental illness by Judge Flores, was forced to go before a jury totally selected by Plaintiff, was declared guilty and sentenced to prison and probation, without Defendant ever knowing the charges or violations involved.

Appendix I

THE 49TH DISTRICT COURT

FOR WEBB COUNTY TEXAS

Cause No. 8548

THE COUNTY OF WEBB AND THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Plaintiff,

THE UNITED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

THE LAREDO INDEPENDANT SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,
Defendant.

Presiding Judges: RUBEN GARCIA, GOODWIN, AND MANUEL FLORES

Plaintiff Counsel: ALVARO GARZA, RICARDO DE ANDA, JOSE RUBIO

Defendant Counsel: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, *Pro se*

Motions:

Civil Action 1985-1988—Defendant has been accused of delinquent mineral taxes, which mineral royalties are in litigation, in federal bankruptcy court. Defendant is forced to pay extortion payments to Plaintiff or confiscate Defendant's property. Defendant was denied a fair hearing, and denied the presentation of the defense.

Appendix I

THE 111TH DISTRICT COURT

FOR WEBB COUNTY TEXAS

Cause No. 31,320

GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC., and
ENSEARCH EXPLORATION, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Defendant.

Presiding Judge: ANTONIO A. ZARDENETTA

Plaintiff Counsel: MORRIS M. REESE, JR., ANTONIO ALVARADO, RICARDO D. PALACIOS, ELMA D. SALINAS[1], SIMON PHILP III

Defendant Counsel: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, *Pro se*

Motions:

Civil Action 1979-1981—Plaintiff and Defendant are still in litigation in federal courts. Defendant was denied her motions and pleadings, and the presentation of the defense. Defendant was cruelly punished for insisting to present the defense. The final judgment of December 1981 declared Defendant guilty of charges without the defense ever presented.

1. Elma D. Salinas is now Presiding Judge for the 341st District Court For Webb County, Texas.

APPENDIX II

Court Opinions

Section A—Court Of Appeals Involved

IN THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 88-2246

Summary Calendar

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

(CA-H-88-0277)

(July 14, 1988)

Before CLARK, Chief Judge, WILLIAMS and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Maria Graciela Ramirez appeals from the district court's dismissal of her lawsuit based on alleged violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. We affirm.

* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Appendix II

Section B—Court Of Appeals Rehearing

IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 88-2246

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING
(August 4, 1988)

Before CLARK, Chief Judge, WILLIAMS and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for rehearing filed in the above entitled and numbered cause be and the same is hereby denied.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT:
CHARLES CLARK
Chief Judge

Appendix II

Section C—United States District Court

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

Civil Action No. H-88-0277

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

vs.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is a letter to the Clerks, filed on February 16, 1988, regarding the assignment to the undersigned judge of the above referenced cause. This letter expresses Plaintiff's "dread fear" of "terrorist Mexican-American/LULAC judges . . . as evil as any Nazi gestapo"; the Court construes it as a motion for recusal. Plaintiff has improperly filed this action against the United States of America since her complaint is clearly directed against the "terrorist government" and judiciary of the State of Texas for allegedly depriving Hispanic female residents apparently of all of their rights. After reviewing the record, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's motion for recusal should be denied as frivolous and that this action should be dismissed as a meritless and nonsensical claim that fails to state a cause of action under Rule 12(b)(6), Fed.R.Civ.P.

Appendix II

Plaintiff's complaint is a vague, conclusory, meandering attack, without any clarifying or supporting factual basis, of the "terrorist" State of Texas. The eleventh amendment provides all states with sovereign immunity against Section 1983 actions, absent a clear and express waiver by the state. Furthermore, it bars federal courts from entertaining suits by private parties against states unless Congress has provided otherwise. *Chiz's Motel* v. *Mississippi State Tax Commission,* 750 F.2d 1305, 1307 (5th Cir. 1985); *Quern* v. *Jordan,* 440 U.S. 332 U.S. 781 (1978); *Edelman* v. *Jordan,* 415 U.S. 651 (1974). The State of Texas has not waived its eleventh amendment immunity by express constitutional or statutory provisions that indicate an intention to subject Texas to suit in federal court. *Atascadero State Hospital* v. *Scanlon,* 105 S.Ct. 3142 (1985). Moreover, even a suit against a state official for enforcing an unconstitutional statute, which Plaintiff's pleading does not appear to assert, can only pray for prospective, injunctive relief, but never for retroactive monetary damages. *Edelman,* 415 U.S. at 651. Here Plaintiff's request for forty million dollars in damages is patently barred. As for claims against Texas courts, judges are cloaked with absolute immunity for judicial acts within their jurisdiction, even if their decisions are erroneous, malicious, or beyond their authority. *Stump* v. *Sparkman,* 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978); *Eitel* v. *Holland,* 787 F.2d 995, 998 (5th Cir. 1986).

Even more to the point, this Court, with its extremely congested docket, exacerbated at present by the absence of five authorized judges, cannot function as a mental health facility for emotionally disturbed complainants. Plaintiff

even notes in her pleadings that another judge publicly stated that she is mentally ill. Upon inquiry, this Court learned from the state district court in Laredo, Texas, that Plaintiff was tried by jury for assault with a deadly weapon, found guilty, and sentenced on January 8, 1988 to four years, which sentence was probated two years. Only because psychiatric testing was ordered during those proceedings does this Court refrain from ordering such now. After sentencing, Plaintiff chose not to appeal, as she indicated in a letter to that Court. Accordingly, the Court

ORDERS that this motion is DENIED as meritless and frivolous and that this senseless cause of action is DISMISSED with prejudice because it fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted.

DONE in Houston, Texas, this 24th day of February, 1988.

/s/ JAMES DEANDA

JAMES DEANDA

United States District Judge

APPENDIX III

Relevant Information

Section A—Violations Of Rights

In the *Fourth and Eighth Amendment* rights violations upon Petitioner—the terror and torture squad of Webb County (Texas) sheriff stormed to the entrance door of Petitioner's home, and without any kind of warrant, subjugated Petitioner by the arms, imposed cattle-prods to the head until rendered unconscious, then entered her home and seized her property. The criminal trespasser into Petitioner's ranch, had threatened that his friend the sheriff would punish her.

At another time, (Dec. 2-3, 1986) the terror and torture squad held Petitioner as hostage inside her home for 24 hours, until forced to sign false confessions, without Miranda Rights, or knowing what was being signed.

In the *Fifth Amendment* violations of rights—Petitioner, falsely identified as a criminal, was forced to be a witness against herself, deprived of a fair hearing and a fair trial, and deprived of liberties, fingerprinted as a criminal, and identified as a criminal based on perjury charges of false testimony.

In the *Sixth Amendment* violations of rights—Petitioner was maliciously accused as a criminal by the news-media, was denied a Change Of Venue, was denied a speedy trial, was denied an impartial jury, and forced to go before a jury totally selected by the prosecution.

Appendix III

In the *Fourteenth Amendment* violations of rights—Petitioner was denied due process of law when her defense was denied, when Petitioner was imposed with one-sided judgments that excluded her defense, was deprived of her property without due process of law, was denied the equal protection of the law, by being imposed with intimidations, terror and torture, was publicly declared as mentally ill without reason or cause, and was denied the presentation of motions, pleadings, and petitions.

In the violation of rights under *U.S.C. 42, Section 1983*—Petitioner was deprived of her rights by officers of the law who entered her home without warrants and tortured her, and when officers of the law tortured Petitioner into signing false confessions without civil or Miranda rights. Petitioner was denied the privileges and immunities secured by the Constitution, when within the Courts Petitioner was denied due process of law.

In the violations of rights under *U.S.C. 42, Section 1985*—Petitioner was denied equal protection of the law and due course of justice, when forced to go before a court trial that had no hopes of a fair hearing or fair trial, where four cases were imposed at one time—where the witnesses of Petitioner were intimidated and harrassed.

In the violations of rights under *U.S.C. 18, Section 241 and Section 242* (Conspiracy against rights of citizens—and Deprivation of rights under color of law)—Petitioner was denied her rights when there was a conspiracy between the judges (state and federal), and the District Attorney for

Webb County, Texas, and the psychiatrist to declare Petitioner as mentally ill, so as to silence her voice forever—and to intimidate all Hispanic women who should try to approach the Texas and federal courts as pro se. Petitioner was denied her rights, when under color of law and conspiracy, the Webb County (Texas) sheriff, the District Attorney for Webb County, Texas, and the presiding judge for the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas—conspired to capture, intimidate, terrorize, torture, and deny every vestige of rights before the court to Petitioner so as to rob Petitioner of her property, and to silence her voice for justice by declaring Petitioner as mentally ill, and sending her to prison on false charges. The subjugation of rights, and silencing the voice of women before the courts, are practiced in the Soviet Union in conspiracies between judges, attorneys, and psychiatrists—and now in the Texas and federal courts of the United States of America.

Appendix III

Section B—Fact Information

Part of Court transcript of August 17, 1987

49th DISTRICT COURT, WEBB COUNTY, TEXAS

Judge MANUEL FLORES

Cause No. 20,730

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Defendant.

The Defendant: What did you say? What did you tell me?

The Court: All right. the DA will submit the order.

The Defendant: But why?

The Court: And the Motion For Change Of Venue is denied.

The Defendant: Why? Who has found me—

The Court: Just a second.

The Defendant: Well, what is the reason?

The Court: Just a second. Listen to what I'm saying, Ms. Ramirez. The Motion For Change Of Venue is denied. You are ordered to submit to a mental evaluation by Doctor Sanchez. This case is reset for the November Pre-Trial.

The Defendant: Well, here is—You refused to let—So, here is what I was supposed to have in my transcript because this will be going to the Federal Court. It's the copy—Here is the copy.

The Court: I don't want to see it, if it has nothing to go with this

Appendix III

F. M. CANSECO M.D. F.A.C.S.
1419 GUADALUPE ST.
LAREDO, TEXAS 78040
512-723-4306

Aug. 17, 1987

Mr. Manuel Flores,
District Judge, 49th. District Court,
Laredo, Texas, 78040.

RE: Maria Graciela Ramirez
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas.

Dear Sir:

I have treated Miss Maria Graciela Ramirez for many years for medical conditions.

In all these years she has at no time impressed me of being in need of psychiatric consultation.

Sincerely Yours

s/ F.M. CANSECO M.D.

F.M. CANSECO M.D.

FMC/ea

Appendix III

Section C—The Inhuman Ordeal

Petitioner, who lives alone, arrived at her ranch, Rancho El Nazareno (The Nazarene Ranch), located south of Laredo, Texas. It was November 8, 1986. As Petitioner, along with two of the hunters, worked along the barb-wire main fence, a criminal trespasser that has taken the ranch by force and aggression—drove up from deep inside the ranch.

The criminal trespasser, along with other cowards, have taken Rancho El Nazareno by force and aggression—by breaking the gates, the lock chains, breaking fences, setting fires along the ranch paths, breaking the windmill, shooting at the campsite cabins, and threatening Petitioner. Petitioner has been shot-at from ambush several times.

On November 8, 1986, Petitioner ordered the two criminal trespassers to get down from their truck, and walk out of the ranch, so as to keep their truck as evidence. Suddenly the criminal trespassers ran the motor of their truck, and quickly drove directly at Petitioner, as trying to ram the truck of Petitioner and break the closed gate to get out. Petitioner quickly drew her gun, and fired a warning shot at the ground. The truck of the criminal trespassers stopped within inches of Petitioner. The two hunters with Petitioner were frozen in shock. Petitioner ordered one of the hunters to drive to the nearby ranch neighbor corral, where there was a round-up going on—and to get help. The ranch neighbor owner, and his ranch foreman, along with a ranchhand arrived, and found the criminal trespasser inside Rancho El Nazareno. The criminal trespasser kept shout-

ing that he had rights. Petitioner was holding her gun by the handle, not the trigger, and pointing the gun towards the ground. The ranch neighbors urged Petitioner to let the criminal trespassers go, and to report the vicious incident to the sheriff.

It just so happens that the criminal trespassers into Ranch El Nazareno, help to run the political campaigns for the sheriff, judges, and other city and county officials, so Petitioner had no hopes of justice from the sheriff's department, to the contrary, Petitioner is in dread fear of the sheriff's terror squad.

In a previous occasion in November 1982, when Petitioner had flushed-out the same criminal trespassers from her ranch, the criminal trespasser had threatened Petitioner with getting his friend the sheriff to punish Petitioner—and indeed, a few days later, on November 18, 1982— the terror and torture squad of the sheriff, along with police officials, arrived at the Laredo, Texas home of Petitioner, pulled her out from the house door, subjugated her, and tortured her with cattle-prods to her head, rendered Petitioner unconscious, entered her home, and seized her gun, without any warrants of any kind. As Petitioner crawled inside her home with the sharp pain in her head—the terror and torture squad declared that they did not need any warrants for "mentally deranged" people.

On December 2, 1986, 24 days after the November 8, 1986 encounter inside Rancho El Nazareno, as Petitioner arrived at her home in Laredo, and had locked the front fence gate, and the driveway gate—there arrived a sheriff's car with

several officers, and an unmarked truck with two men. It was the terror and torture squad of the sheriff demanding that petitioner open the gates and go with them. They waved a piece of paper saying it was a warrant. They knew that Petitioner was alone without any witnesses or protection. When Petitioner refused to open the locked gates, the terror and torture squad threatened to jump the fence. After threating Petitioner with all kinds of bodily harm, the terror and torture squad promised that they would be back, to break the locked gates, break the house door, and drag Petitioner to jail.

Then began 24 hours of the most inhuman mental terror and torture for Petitioner, held as hostage inside her home, in deep fear of being dragged out and killed by the terror and torture squad. Along the day of December 3, 1986, Petitioner begged desperately to the FBI, U.S. Attorneys, and other gevernment agencies for help—but all denied help.

A relative of Petitioner asked for the intervention of a judge and of the sheriff. The judge intimidated with blackmail upon Petitioner, and the sheriff threatening with storming the house of Petitioner, and with bodily harm. Petitioner, in near collapse, and trembling with fear, approched the jail with her relative.

At the jail, in deep terror, Petitioner signed the false confession papers forced on her, without any constitutional, civil, or Miranda rights, and Petitioner's relative signed the bond.

Appendix III

The next day, December 4, 1986, the local press publicly tried Petitioner as a vicious criminal while defending the criminal trespasser as a victim. The owner of the newspaper (The Laredo News) in conspiracy with the judge, justice of the peace, sheriff, and District Attorney.

Petitioner was forced into a grand jury, and forced to be a witness against herself. Petitioner was indicted as a criminal in aggravated assault for defending her life inside her ranch.

Then began the long agony from court to court. Petitioner (as pro se) was continually threatened and intimidated by the presiding judge with prison, jail, being committed to a mental institution—and being denied all her motions, petitions, and pleadings. Over and over, the presiding judge denied to Petitioner her motions for a Change Of Venue, denied to Petitioner her constitutional and civil rights, dragged the hearing and trial for one year—and the attorneys for the criminal trespasser worked in conspiracy with the presiding judge to deny Petitioner all her rights.

Petitioner was forced to go before a one-sided jury, totally selected by the prosecution, was declared guilty by the one-sided jury and condemned to four years in prison, two years probation. Petitioner was never told what the charges were, nor the reasons why an Hispanic woman has no rights to self-defense inside her property.

The criminal trespasser, in conspiracy with attorneys and judges, brought a civil action upon Petitioner, so as

to rob Petitioner of her ranch. Again the agony of more court appearances for Petitioner, again denial of all rights upon Petitioner, and again another final judgment without the defense of Petitioner.

On June 30, 1988, the conspiracy of judges and attorneys, friends of the criminal trespasser, declared that Petitioner was guilty and condemned Petitioner, with orders to pay to the criminal trespasser excessive amounts of "damages"—without ever hearing the defense of Petitioner.

Petitioner is now identified and fingerprinted as a criminal, inhumanly punished, robbed of her property, denied of her liberties to vote and other liberties while being held on probation—all the result of a one-sided judgments, one-sided juries, without the defense of Petitioner ever to be presented—and all these injustices and inhumanities happening in Texas U.S.A.

Most of those persons conspiring to deprive Petitioner of her rights are associated somehow with the LULAC organization (League of United Latin American Citizens)—a fake organization of impostors opportunists that use their power jobs to subjugate the rights of the defenseless Hispanic.

Petitioner hopes that one day she will be able to go before a court of justice to present her defense in a fair hearing and a fair trial. In the meantime Petitioner lives as a criminal and on probation, and as an example to other women who should try to use their right to self-defense.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
U.S.A. citizen without rights